DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 379 JC 710 030

AUTHOR Epler, Stephen
TITLE Report on Visitation to California Community Colleges on Self-Instructional Materials.
PUB DATE [70]
NOTE 7p.; Seminar paper

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Autoinstructional Aids, *Autoinstructional Programs, *Educational Programs, *Junior Colleges, *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

This study summarizes the findings of the UCLA Education 261D seminar on Self-Instructional Materials (SIM) in Southern California community colleges. It was determined that little is currently being done in the development of SIM. The obstacles it has encountered are faculty who have reservations about the concept of SIM, and those who have an interest in SIM, but have questions on how to implement it. Knowledge and interest in SIM might be developed through word of mouth by deans of instruction, department chairmen, and individual faculty members. This study includes a discussion of support found and needed for SIM, and lists faculty, at each college visited by the seminar group, who are developing it. [Because of marginal reproducibility of original, this document is not available in hard copy.] (CA)

ED 046379

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

REPORT ON VISITATION

TO CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ON SELF-INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Prepared by Stephen Epler

Education 261D

The Junior College Curriculum

Dr. B. Lamar Johnson

Materials Gathered by

Members of the Seminar

JC 710 030

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 03 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Introduction:

To follow-up the winter conferences on self-instructional materials conducted by Drs. Stuart and Rita Johnson, the UCLA Education 261D seminar on junior college curriculum conducted a survey. The purpose of this survey was to determine the effects of the conferences and to reveal to what extent self-instructional materials (SIM) are being developed in southern California community colleges. Seminar members interviewed individuals who had attended the conferences and sought the answers to several questions:

1) What is presently being done in the development of SIM?

2) Who are the faculty developing SIM that have examples of their work?

3) Who within the faculty seems to serve as a focal point of leadership?

4) Which colleges seem to serve as focal points of leadership?

5) What are the obstacles to the development of SIM?

6) What is being done within a college to spread the word about SIM?

7) What support is found and is needed for the development of SIM?

This report summarizes the findings of the seminar's survey, highlighting the colleges and individuals in the forefront of this movement. Thus, a person interested in SIM could contact an individual in his discipline already developing these materials. Another focus of the report will be upon the obstacles to SIM, as well as upon resources used in counteracting them. Hopefully, this report will accurately describe the present stage of development of SIM and encourage further examination of these materials.

1) What is presently being done in the development of SIM.

On the whole, very little is being done in the area of SIM. Those examples found by members of the seminar usually contained only portions of the comprehensive package presented by the Johnsons, and in most instances antedated the Johnson conferences. Little that was direct and immediate seems attributable at this point to these conferences. There are experiments, often piecemeal, or conditions, such as an innovative atmosphere or one active, interested faculty, that do signal a change from this present state. The conferences did seem to generate some interest, though, but to date it has remained latent. There are some faculty who are active (see below). And four colleges are moving far enough ahead to serve as examples for others, Bakersfield, Palomar, Pasadena and Cerritos.

2) The following three questions have been compiled together to provide examples of active development of SIM. The list below answers question 2:

Who are the faculty developing SIM that have examples of their work.

Two other questions are included in the list. An asterisk by a name indicates an answer to question 3:

Who within the faculty seems to serve as a focal point of leadership.

The fourth question is indicated by underlining the name of the college.

Which Colleges seem to serve as focal points of leadership.

Antelope Valley
*Frank Roberts, calulus (uses Behavioral objectives)
Richard Schenk, data processing

Bakersfield
Mr. Halling, psychology (three auto-tutorials)
*Mr. Jack Hernandez, philosophy and ethics (SIM package on ethics)
Mr. Larsen, library (package on library usage)
*Mr. David Scott, economics (SIM package on national income)
Mr. Ward, chemistry (behavioral objectives; some media)

Cerritos
Mrs. Borgman, chemistry (auto-tutorial)
*Mr. Carlson, remedial math (complete self-instructional program)
Mrs. Sterner, chemistry (self-instructional lab)

Compton
*Ben Ponnech, remedial reading and study
Mr. Thorp, botany

El Camino
Marvyl Doyel, developmental reading
Bob Fedrick, data processing (SIM package in a survey class)
Eugene Kertiens, developmental reading (behavioral objectives)
*Bob Maier, mathematics (SIM package in statistics)

Glendale
*Helen Kinney, mathematics and chemistry

Los Angeles City College
*Mel Lesser, history (auto-tutorial)

Los Angeles Harbor College
*Jo Rae Zuckerman, psychology (some behavioral objectives)

Los Angeles Pierce College
*Ronald Farrar, foreign languages (SIM package in French and Italian)

Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
*Helen Armstrong, apparel (filmstrips)

Moorpark
James Gayle, mathematics (programmed text)
*Stephen Herzog, political science (behavioral objectives)

Palomar
Fred Elliot, botany (Postlewaite-like auto-tutorial lab)
James Keesee, mathematics and electronics
Harry Mahan, psychology (study questions; test items; tapes)
Ester Nesbin, library (SIM package)
*Rita White, art history (complete course in SIM package)

Pasadena City College
*Robert Carter, library (one-unit course on SIM package)
*Joan Davidson, nursing (nothing produced yet)
*Woodrow Ohlsen, English (" " ")
*Richard Woods, English (" " ")

Porterville
*Hans Van Buelow, English (behavioral objectives)

Santa Ana
Mr. Gibson, computer science (remedial math package; auto-tutorial)
*Robert Anderson, English (nothing produced yet)

Santa Barbara City College
*Bob Carman, math-physics (nothing produced yet)

San Bernardino Valley College
*Gil Williams, developmental reading (comprehensive self-instructional reading lab)

San Diego City College
*Paul Roman, general education (behavioral objectives)

Riverside City College
*Fred Thompson, economics (two SIM packages)

The above list details those faculty at each college visited who are developing some SIM. Those names preceeded with an asterisk are individuals who may serve as focal points of leadership in the development of SIM. Other colleges were visited, but not included on the list because no names were suggested. There were four colleges whose names were underlined to indicate that they may serve as focal points of leadership. They are Bakersfield, Cerritos, Palomar, and Pasadena City.

5) What are the obstacles to the development of SIM.

Obstacles to the development of SIM aan be catagorized under one of two headings. First, faculty have reservations about the concept itself. Second, how can interested faculty implement their interest? Many doubts and reservations result from incomplete understanding of the nature of SIM.

What is the role of the instructor once SIM are developed? Can SIM overcome lethargy and poor motivation among some students? Is there a difference between programmed instruction and SIM? Isn't the concept of SIM limited to remedial- or skill-level courses? Aren't SIM mechanistic or, worse yet, non-humanistic? Can students participate in establishing course objectives with SIM? Uncertainty over these issues forestalls action by many partially interested faculty. To overcome this uncertainty and to satisfy the sincere doubts of faculty actively opposed to SIM, these questions must be forthrightly confronted.

Other obstacles exist. How can interested faculty be mobilized? Specifically, how can time and money be provided? Because the concept of SIM appears to depart considerably from conventional practices, instructors are reluctant to experiment without added time or compensation. And added equipment, staff, secretaries, research, even computers, involve money. Furthermore, because some faculty feel the need for direction and occasional assistance, consultant time may be required.

6) What is being done within a college to spread the word about SIM.

Efforts to interest faculty in SIM come from at least four sources. A most significant role in many colleges is played by the Dean of Instruction. For instance, at Mt. San Antonio College he promoted the UCLA conferences, contacted individual faculty, and is organizing summer workshops. Other Deans work with department chairmen or circulate the Johnson workbooks. A second source is the department chairmen, although their efforts, at least immediately, affects only one department. A third source in an individual faculty member, who proselytes by explaining the concepts

to his colleagues and by providing examples of his own efforts. In two instances, San Diego City College and San Bernardino Valley College, the role of such a faculty member seemed critical. Two colleges, Los Angeles City and Compton, are using another source, a UCLA administrative intern, who is in part charged with promoting SIM. By creating a general atmosphere of awareness through bulletins and newsletters and by talking with individual faculty or small groups, the intern may create an interest.

7) What support is found and is needed for the development of SIM.

Support for the concept may be found in a number of areas. Presidents and Deans of Instruction seem to know something of SIM and encourage experimentation. There are pockets of interest among some faculty, who, with time, could serve as exemplars. And many current practices in colleges are prerequisites to the full usage of SIM. Those colleges and faculty using behavioral objectives are several spaces ahead. Some are using programmed texts with pre- and post-tests. Some colleges have faculty working in these areas at UCLA. Some colleges have much instructional innovation going on, so a climate of change is already established.

What more support is needed? First, released-time seems to be a universal plea. By providing a few faculty to work up materials, pilot examples are developed for others. Second, examples of SIM packages are widely sought. Packages already in use could assist interested faculty. Third, articulation with UCLA is desired. Many colleges requested an extension course on their campus or consultant help. Fourth, summer workshops or summer grants-in-aid might help. Finally, more money would be a great boon, but what else is new?